

Joseph R. Manning, Jr., Esq. (State Bar No. 223381)
Michael J. Manning, Esq. (State Bar No. 286879)
Craig G. Côté, Esq. (State Bar No. 132885)
Osman M. Taher, Esq. (State Bar No. 272441)
David M. Fitzgerald (State Bar No. 282471)
MANNING LAW, APC
20062 SW Birch Street, Ste. 200
Newport Beach, CA 92660
Office: (949) 200-8755
ADAPracticeGroup@manninglawoffice.com

Attorneys for Plaintiff: JAMES RUTHERFORD

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA – EASTERN DIVISION

JAMES RUTHERFORD, an
individual,

Plaintiff,

v.

J C G GROUP INC., a California
corporation; TAKAO KATAYAMA,
a married man as his sole and
separate property; and DOES 1-10,
inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No.

**Complaint For Damages And
Injunctive Relief For:**

- 1. VIOLATIONS OF THE
AMERICANS WITH DISABILITIES
ACT OF 1990, 42 U.S.C. §12181 *et*
seq.**
- 2. VIOLATIONS OF THE UNRUH
CIVIL RIGHTS ACT, CALIFORNIA
CIVIL CODE § 51 *et seq.***

Plaintiff, JAMES RUTHERFORD (“Plaintiff”), complains of Defendants J C
G GROUP INC., a California corporation; TAKAO KATAYAMA, a married man
as his sole and separate property; and DOES 1-10 (“Defendants”) and alleges as

1 follows:

2 **PARTIES:**

3 1. Plaintiff is an adult California resident. Plaintiff is substantially limited
4 in performing one or more major life activities, including but not limited to:
5 walking, standing, ambulating, sitting, in addition to twisting, turning, and grasping
6 objects. As a result of these disabilities, Plaintiff relies upon mobility devices,
7 including at times a wheelchair, to ambulate. With such disabilities, Plaintiff
8 qualifies as a member of a protected class under the Americans with Disabilities Act
9 (“ADA”), 42 U.S.C. §12102(2) and the regulations implementing the ADA set forth
10 at 28 C.F.R. §§ 36.101 et seq. At the time of Plaintiff’s visits to Defendant’s facility
11 and prior to instituting this action, Plaintiff suffered from a “qualified disability”
12 under the ADA, including those set forth in this paragraph. Plaintiff is also the
13 holder of a Disabled Person Parking Placard.

14 2. Plaintiff brings this action acting as a “private attorney general” as
15 permitted under the American with Disabilities Act of 1990 (“ADA”) to privatize
16 enforcement of the ADA without the American tax payer(s) bearing the financial tax
17 burden for such action.

18 3. Defendant TAKAO KATAYAMA, a married man as his sole and
19 separate property, owned the property located at 12220 Pigeon Pass Road # Vxy,
20 Moreno Valley, California 92553 (“Property”) on November 29, 2018.

21 4. Defendant TAKAO KATAYAMA, a married man as his sole and
22 separate property, owns the Property currently.

23 5. J C G GROUP INC., a California corporation, owned, operated and
24 controlled the business of Papa Joes Sports Bar (“Business”) on November 29,
25 2018.

26 6. J C G GROUP INC., a California corporation, owns, operates and
27
28

1 controls the Business currently.

2 7. Plaintiff does not know the true names of Defendants, their business
3 capacities, their ownership connection to the Property and Business, or their relative
4 responsibilities in causing the access violations herein complained of, and alleges a
5 joint venture and common enterprise by all such Defendants. Plaintiff is informed
6 and believes that each of the Defendants herein, including Does 1 through 10,
7 inclusive, is responsible in some capacity for the events herein alleged, or is a
8 necessary party for obtaining appropriate relief. Plaintiff will seek leave to amend
9 when the true names, capacities, connections, and responsibilities of the Defendants
10 and Does 1 through 10, inclusive, are ascertained.

11 **JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

12 8. This Court has subject matter jurisdiction over this action pursuant
13 to 28 U.S.C. § 1331 and § 1343(a)(3) & (a)(4) for violations of the Americans
14 with Disabilities Act of 1990, 42 U.S.C. § 12101, et seq. ("ADA").

15 9. This court has supplemental jurisdiction over Plaintiff's non-federal
16 claims pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1367, because Plaintiff's UCRA claims are so
17 related to Plaintiff's federal ADA claims in that they have the same nucleus of
18 operative facts and arising out of the same transactions, they form part of the same
19 case or controversy under Article III of the United States Constitution.

20 10. Venue is proper in this court pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §1391 because the
21 Property which is the subject of this action is located in this district and because
22 Plaintiff's causes of action arose in this district.

23 **FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS**

24 11. Plaintiff went to the Business on or about November 29, 2018 to
25 purchase lunch.

26 12. The Business, including the Property, is a facility open to the public, a
27 place of public accommodation, and a business establishment.

28 13. Parking spaces are some of the facilities, privileges and advantages

1 reserved by Defendants to persons patronizing the Business and Property.

2 14. Unfortunately, although parking spaces were some of the facilities
3 reserved for patrons, there were barriers for persons with disabilities that cause the
4 named facilities to fail as to compliance with the Americans with Disability Act
5 Accessibility Guidelines (“ADAAG”) on or around November 29, 2018, or at any
6 time thereafter up to and including, the date of the filing of this complaint.

7 15. Instead of having architectural barrier free facilities for patrons with
8 disabilities, Plaintiff experienced the following at the Business and Property: the
9 curb ramp connecting the accessible parking spaces to the route leading to the main
10 entrance projects into the vehicular traffic lane in violation of Section 406.5 which
11 requires that curb ramps and the flared sides of curb ramps shall be located so that
12 they do not project into vehicular traffic lanes, parking spaces, or parking access
13 aisles; there is no accessible route connecting the parking to an accessible entrance
14 per Sections 206.4 and 208.3.1; and, the space between the grab bar and projecting
15 objects above shall be 12 inches (305 mm) minimum per Section 609.3. Here, the
16 seat cover dispenser is within that space blocking access to the rear grab bar.

17 16. Subject to the reservation of rights to assert further violations of law
18 after a site inspection found *infra*, Plaintiff asserts there are additional ADA
19 violations which affect him personally.

20 17. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that, currently,
21 there are no compliant, accessible Business facilities designed, reserved and
22 available to persons with disabilities at the Business in addition to that alleged *supra*.

23 18. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that Defendants
24 had no policy or plan in place to make sure that the parking spaces were compliant
25 for persons with disabilities and remained compliant prior to November 29, 2018.

26 19. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges Defendants have
27 no policy or plan in place to make sure that the complaints of violations alleged
28 above are available to persons with disabilities and remain compliant currently.

1 20. Plaintiff personally encountered the above alleged barriers when
2 attempting to access the Business and Property. These inaccessible conditions
3 denied the Plaintiff full and equal access and caused him difficulty, humiliation,
4 frustration and upset.

5 21. As an individual with a mobility disability who at times is dependent
6 upon a mobility device, Plaintiff has a keen interest in whether public
7 accommodations have architectural barriers that impede full accessibility to those
8 accommodations by individuals with mobility impairments.

9 22. Plaintiff is being deterred from patronizing the Business and its
10 accommodations on particular occasions, but intends to return to the Business for the
11 dual purpose of availing himself of the goods and services offered to the public and
12 to ensure that the Business ceases evading its responsibilities under federal and state
13 law.

14 23. As a result of his difficulty, humiliation, and frustration because of the
15 inaccessible condition of the facilities of the Business, Plaintiff did not fully access
16 the Business or Property. However, Plaintiff would like to return to the location
17 given its close proximity to an area he frequents from time to time.

18 24. The defendants have failed to maintain in working and useable
19 conditions those features required to provide ready access to persons with
20 disabilities.

21 25. The violations identified above are easily removed without much
22 difficulty or expense. They are the types of barriers identified by the Department of
23 Justice as presumably readily achievable to remove and, in fact, these barriers are
24 readily achievable to remove. Moreover, there are numerous alternative
25 accommodations that could be made to provide a greater level of access if complete
26 removal were not achievable.

27 26. Given the obvious and blatant violation alleged hereinabove, Plaintiff
28 alleges, on information and belief, that there are other violations and barriers in the

1 site that relate to his disabilities. Plaintiff will amend the complaint, to provide
 2 proper notice regarding the scope of this lawsuit, once he conducts a site inspection.
 3 However, please be on notice that Plaintiff seeks to have all barriers related to their
 4 disabilities remedied. See *Doran v. 7-11*, 524 F.3d 1034 (9th Cir. 2008) (holding
 5 that once a plaintiff encounters one barrier at a site, he can sue to have all barriers
 6 that relate to his disability removed regardless of whether he personally encountered
 7 them).

8 27. Given the obvious and blatant violation alleged hereinabove, Plaintiff
 9 alleges, on information and belief, that the failure to remove these barriers was
 10 intentional because: (1) these particular barriers are intuitive and obvious; (2) the
 11 defendants exercised control and dominion over the conditions at this location, and
 12 therefore, (3) the lack of accessible facilities was not an accident because had the
 13 defendants intended any other configuration, they had the means and ability to make
 14 the change.

15 28. Without injunctive relief, plaintiff will continue to be unable to fully
 16 access Defendants' facilities in violation of Plaintiff's rights under the ADA.

17 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

18 **VIOLATIONS OF THE AMERICANS WITH DISABILITIES ACT OF 1990,**

19 **42 U.S.C. § 12181 et seq.**

20 29. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference all paragraphs alleged
 21 above and each and every other paragraph in this Complaint necessary or helpful to
 22 state this cause of action as though fully set forth herein.

23 30. Under the ADA, it is an act of discrimination to fail to ensure that the
 24 privileges, advantages, accommodations, facilities, goods, and services of any place
 25 of public accommodation are offered on a full and equal basis by anyone who owns,
 26 leases, or operates a place of public accommodation. See 42 U.S.C. § 12182(a).
 27 Discrimination is defined, inter alia, as follows:

28 a. A failure to make reasonable modifications in policies, practices,

1 or procedures, when such modifications are necessary to afford
2 goods, services, facilities, privileges, advantages, or
3 accommodations to individuals with disabilities, unless the
4 accommodation would work a fundamental alteration of those
5 services and facilities. 42 U.S.C. § 12182(b)(2)(A)(ii).

6 b. A failure to remove architectural barriers where such removal is
7 readily achievable. 42 U.S.C. § 12182(b)(2)(A)(iv). Barriers are
8 defined by reference to the ADAAG, found at 28 C.F.R., Part 36,
9 Appendix "D".

10 c. A failure to make alterations in such a manner that, to the
11 maximum extent feasible, the altered portions of the facility are
12 readily accessible to and usable by individuals with disabilities,
13 including individuals who use wheelchairs, or to ensure that, to
14 the maximum extent feasible, the path of travel to the altered area
15 and the bathrooms, telephones, and drinking fountains serving
16 the area, are readily accessible to and usable by individuals with
17 disabilities. 42 U.S.C. § 12183(a)(2).

18 31. Any business that provides parking spaces must provide accessible
19 parking spaces. 1991 Standards § 4.1.2(5). 2010 Standards § 208. Under the 1991
20 Standards, parking spaces and access aisles must be level with surface slopes not
21 exceeding 1:50 (2.0%) in all directions. 1991 Standards § 4.6.2. Under the 2010
22 Standards, access aisles shall be at the same level as the parking spaces they serve.
23 Changes in level are not permitted. 2010 Standards § 502.4. "Access aisles are
24 required to be nearly level in all directions to provide a surface for wheelchair
25 transfer to and from vehicles." 2010 Standards § 502.4 Advisory. Specifically, built
26 up curb ramps are not permitted to project into access aisles and parking spaces. Id.
27 No more than a 1:48 slope is permitted. Standards § 502.4.

28 32. Here, the failure to ensure that accessible facilities were available and

1 ready to be used by Plaintiff is a violation of law.

2 33. A public accommodation must maintain in operable working condition
3 those features of its facilities and equipment that are required to be readily accessible
4 to and usable by persons with disabilities. 28 C.F.R. § 36.211(a).

5 34. Given its location and options, Plaintiff will continue to desire to
6 patronize the Business but he has been and will continue to be discriminated against
7 due to lack of accessible facilities and, therefore, seek injunctive relief to remove the
8 barriers.

9 **SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION**

10 **VIOLATION OF THE UNRUH CIVIL RIGHTS ACT, CALIFORNIA CIVIL**

11 **CODE § 51 *et seq.***

12 35. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference all paragraphs alleged
13 above and each and every other paragraph in this Complaint necessary or helpful to
14 state this cause of action as though fully set forth herein.

15 36. California Civil Code § 51 *et seq.* guarantees equal access for people
16 with disabilities to the accommodations, advantages, facilities, privileges, and
17 services of all business establishments of any kind whatsoever. Defendants are
18 systematically violating the UCRA, Civil Code § 51 *et seq.*

19 37. Because Defendants violate Plaintiff's rights under the ADA, they also
20 violated the Unruh Civil Rights Act and are liable for damages. (Civ. Code § 51(f),
21 52(a).) These violations are ongoing.

22 38. Defendants' actions constitute intentional discrimination against
23 Plaintiff on the basis of their individual disabilities, in violation of the UCRA, Civil
24 Code § 51 *et seq.* Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges Defendants
25 have been previously put on actual notice that its premises are inaccessible to
26 Plaintiff as above alleged. Despite this knowledge, Defendants maintain the
27 Property and Business in an inaccessible form.
28

PRAYER

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays that this court award damages provide relief as follows:

1. A preliminary and permanent injunction enjoining Defendants from further violations of the ADA, 42 U.S.C. § 12181 *et seq.*, and UCRA, Civil Code § 51 *et seq.* with respect to its operation of the Business and Subject Property; **Note: Plaintiff is not invoking section 55 of the California Civil Code and is not seeking injunctive relief under the Disable Persons Act at all.**

2. An award of actual damages and statutory damages of not less than \$4,000 per violation pursuant to § 52(a) of the California Civil Code and \$4,000 for each time he visits an establishment that contains architectural barriers that deny the Plaintiff of full and equal enjoyment of the premises (*Feezor v. Del Taco, Inc.* (2005) 431 F.Supp.2d 1088, 1091.)

3. An additional award of \$4,000.00 as deterrence damages for each violation pursuant to *Johnson v. Guedoir*, 218 F. Supp. 3d 1096; 2016 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 150740 (USDC Cal, E.D. 2016);

4. For reasonable attorneys' fees, litigation expenses, and costs of suit, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 12205; California Civil Code § 52;

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

Plaintiff hereby respectfully request a trial by jury on all appropriate issues raised in this Complaint.

Dated: February 28, 2019

MANNING LAW, APC

By: /s/ Joseph R. Manning Jr., Esq.

Joseph R. Manning Jr., Esq.

Michael J. Manning, Esq.

Craig G. Côté, Esq.

Osman M. Taher, Esq.

Attorneys for Plaintiff